

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.hspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/675,518	09/29/2000	Joel A. Drewes	030641.0017.CON1	1569
30542	7590 09/29/2003			
FOLEY & LARDNER			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 80278 SAN DIEGO, CA 92138-0278			FORMAN, BETTY J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1634	
			DATE MAILED: 09/29/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	A1:4: NI	A 1: 4(a)
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/675,518	DREWES ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	BJ Forman	1634
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 10 September 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper reply to a
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	,
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period o fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of t (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	f extension and the corresponding amo he shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>28 August 2003</u> . Ap 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) $oxed{\boxtimes}$ they raise new issues that would require furthe	r consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be	elow);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancelingNOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	on(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amendment
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because:	reconsideration has been consideration	dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(explanation of how the new or amended claims wo		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>51-82</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a	a) approved or b) disappr	oved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen		•
10. Other:	-(-)(· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·

The amendments add limitations drawn to an optically functional layer having an optical property which is detectably altered upon a change in mass related to analyte binding. The limitations have not previously been presented or considered. Therefore the new limitations would require further search and consideration.

Applicant's arguments have been considered. However, arguments regarding the new limitations are deemed moot because the new limitations have not been entered. Applicant argues that Kobashi does not teach the attachment layer thickness as recited in Claim 52. The argument has been considered but is not found persuasive because the claim recites "about 50" angstroms to "about 3000" angstroms. The broad claim language "about" encompasses a wide range of thickness thereby encompassing the teaching of Kobashi.

BJ FORMAN, PH.D. PRIMARY EXAMINER